1					
2					
3					
4					
5	BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL				
6	In the Matter of Application No. 2003-01 EXHIBIT 90 (GTT-T)				
7			COUNSEL FOR THE		
8	SAGEBRUSH POWER PARTNERS, LLC.		ENVIRONMENT'S PREFILED		
9			DIRECT TESTIMONT		
10	PROJECT				
11	COUNSEL FOR THE ENVIRONMENT'S PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY				
12		WITNESS: G. TH	IOMAS IEBB		
13	A.	BACKGROUND			
14	Q.	Please state your name and business addre	ess for the record.		
15	A.	G. Thomas Tebb. The address is 15 We	est Yakima Avenue, Suite 200, Yakima, WA		
16		98902.			
17	Q.	Where are you employed?			
18	A.	Washington State Department of Ecolo	ogy (Ecology), Central Regional Office in		
19		Yakima, Washington.			
20	Q.	What is your position at Ecology?			
21	A.	Section Manager, Water Quality Program.			
22	Q.	What are your duties and responsibilities a	as Section Manager?		
23	A.	I manage the Water Quality Section in t	the Central Regional Office, which covers 7		
24		counties: Benton; Chelan; Douglas; Kitti	tas; Klickitat; Okanogan; and Yakima. The		
25		Water Quality Section assures the in	mplementation of water quality laws and		
26		regulations. This Section issues state	e and federal delegated permits, conducts		

1		enforcement actions, regulates nonpoint activities, and ensures that natural resource
2		decisions impacting public, local government, state and federal agencies are consistent
3		with environmental laws, and policies of Washington State. I manage an organization
4		of approximately 28 employees, including two unit managers.
5	Q.	Please identify what has been marked as exhibit GTT-1?
6	A.	Exhibit GTT-1 is a copy of my resume which includes my educational background and
7		professional employment experiences.
8	Q.	Are you familiar with Sagebrush Power Partners LLC's application to build the Kittitas
9		Valley Wind Power Project (KVWPP)?
10	A.	Yes. I was asked by Counsel for the Environment to provide a professional independent
11		analysis of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project's Draft Environmental Impact
12		Statement (DEIS) and supporting documentation as it relates to the protection of
13		surface and groundwater in the proposed project area.
14	Q.	What documents have you reviewed?
15	A.	I have reviewed the Application for Site Certification (ASC), the ASC Clarification
16		Information, the DEIS, and the prefiled testimony of Michael Pappalardo and Peggy
17		O'Neil.
18	Q.	Is the information contained in these sections and exhibits within your area of
19		expertise?
20	A.	Yes. I am a Licensed Geologist, Hydrogeologist, and Engineering Geologist (license
21		#408) in the State of Washington. I have over seventeen years of environmental
22		engineering, consulting, complex regulatory problem solving, and management
23		experience that adequately enable me to provide a professional opinion on the matters
24		on which I am being asked to comment.
25	В.	DUST
26	0	Do you believe the Applicant's mitigation proposals are adequate?

1	A.	Yes.
2	Q.	Are there any mitigation measures you believe are critical for environmental protection
3		purposes?
4	A.	The most important aspect of protecting surface and groundwater quality will be the
5		effectiveness of the Field Site Management Team in ensuring that the environmental
6		requirements and mitigation measures are followed as closely as planned, and modified
7		as necessary, to prevent any impact to surface and groundwater quality during
8		construction, operation, and reclamation of the project lands after project
9		decommissioning.
10	Q.	Are there any mitigation measures you believe the Applicant should implement that it
11		does not currently intend to implement?
12	A.	No, I believe the applicant has identified and addressed all of the foreseeable potential
13		impacts associated with protection of surface and groundwater quality associated with
14		the project.
15	C.	EROSION
16	Q.	If the project is built and eventually decommissioned, the Applicant has proposed to
17		leave the vast majority of the cement and construction materials anchoring the turbine
18		in the ground. Approximately 26 feet of cement and construction materials will be left
19		behind at each turbine. Do you have any concerns about this material being left in the
20		ground?
21	A.	No, the cement once cured will act and weather much like existing basalt bedrock in the
22		area.
23	Q.	The Applicant has proposed to cement the trenches dug to encase the underground
24		electrical transmission cables laid throughout the project. Do you have any concerns
25		about miles of cement trenches that will be added to the land within the project area?
26		

1	A.	No. The proposed use of cement in the underground electrical trenches for the project
2		is of limited scope, and would be only used in areas were bedrock is at the surface or
3		extremely shallow. The purpose of using cement to encase and adequately protect
4		those electrical transmission cables is reasonable and appropriate. However, it maybe
5		prudent to leave some amount of space (six inches minimum) for natural fill materials
6		to be placed over the cement such that after project decommissioning the electrical
7		trench excavation would better blend with the surrounding landscape.
8	Q.	The Applicant has proposed to leave the trenches in place if the project is
9		decommissioned. Do you have any concerns about leaving these trenches cemented?
10	A.	No. See my response above.
11	D.	EROSION DURING CONSTRUCTION
12	Q.	The Applicant has proposed to utilize Best Management Practices (BMP) in the
13		construction of the project, to reduce erosion concerns. Are there any BMP's that you
14		believe should be required?
15	A.	The most important aspect of protecting surface and groundwater quality will be the
16		effectiveness of the Field Site Management Team in ensuring that the environmental
17		requirements and mitigation measures are followed as closely as planned, and modified
18		as necessary, to prevent any impact to surface and groundwater quality during
19		construction, operation, and reclamation of the project lands after project
20		decommissioning.
21	Q.	Do you believe the Applicant's mitigation proposals are adequate?
22	A.	Yes.
23	Q.	Are there any mitigation measures you believe are critical for environmental protection
24		purposes?
25	A.	I believe that the applicant has adequately identified and addressed the necessary

environmental protection measures for erosion protection for the project.

Q. Are there any mitigation measures you believe the Applicant should implement that it 1 does not currently intend to implement? 2 No. See previous response. 3 A. 4 Ε. STORM WATER RUNOFF Do you have any concerns regarding storm water runoff? 5 Q. 6 A. The most important aspect of protecting surface and groundwater quality will be the effectiveness of the Field Site Management Team in ensuring that the environmental 7 requirements and mitigation measures are followed as closely as planned, and modified 8 as necessary, to prevent any impact to surface and groundwater quality during 9 construction, operation, and reclamation of the project lands after project 10 decommissioning. 11 Do you believe the Applicant's mitigation proposals are adequate? Q. 12 Yes. 13 Α. Are there any mitigation measures you believe are critical for environmental protection Q. 14 purposes? 15 A. An effective Field Site Management Team and Quality Assurance /Quality Control 16 (QA/QC) protocols. 17 Are there any mitigation measures you believe the Applicant should implement that it 18 Q. does not currently intend to implement? 19 No. A. 20 21 F. **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** Q. Do you have any concerns regarding the lubricant the Applicant intends to use in the 22 turbines? 23 No. 24 Α. Do you believe the Applicant's mitigation proposals are adequate? 25 Q. Yes.

	purposes?
A.	Yes, training as necessary to ensure personnel are familiar with and can implement spill
	prevention and control throughout the various phases of the project.
Q.	Are there any mitigation measures you believe the Applicant should implement that it
	does not currently intend to implement?
A.	No.
G.	WETLANDS
Q.	Do you have any reason to believe there are any other jurisdictional wetlands not
	identified by the Applicant's experts?
A.	No I do not.
Q.	Do you have any reason to question the wetland information contained in the
	documents you have reviewed?
A.	No.
Q.	Do you believe the Applicant's mitigation proposals are adequate?
A.	Yes.
Q.	Are there any mitigation measures you believe are critical for environmental protection
	purposes?
A.	Again, a properly trained and empowered Field Site Management Team and QA/QC
	protocols.
Q.	Are there any mitigation measures you believe the Applicant should implement that it
	does not currently intend to implement?
A.	No.
	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.